App. F. IX-4

Previous References 1934. 25 (Mary) File No. 302—34

Serial Nos. 1—6

Later References.
May 129—35:—Hfc:—

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 6

Part B for September 1935

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Sri Raghupathi Sastry against the Order of the R.C. dated 7-11-34 approving of the appointment of Rangaswami Jois to the post of Patagar of Sri Sitaramaswamy Temple Nanjangud in preference to him

No 276 Date 26-8-1935

To Raghupathi Sastry
WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34
Grandson of Gunabathy
Sri Sitaramaswamy Temple
Nanjangud

Informs that his Appeal petn
No 277 dy 26-8-35
to the R.C.
forwarded to Govt

Serial No.

1

Petition dated 11/1/35
From Raghunath Narayan Avadhani
[illegible]
Appeal [illegible]

If approved the connected papers will be called for from the M.C and the merits of the case noted upon on receipt of the said papers

Petition may be sent to me. for report with records.

Ch: Engr

I agree

26/1/35

28/1/35

25/1/35

Memo on the petition is perhaps

2/2/35

Send to Muz Comr with no 1098/Encs
on 5-2-35

6/2/35

Note–Contn. Sheet.

Mad. File No. 302 of 1934

General and Revenue Secretariat

Letter No. H.C.91/34-35 dy 6.4.35 from the Madras Commissioner submitting records relating to the appeal petition of Raghupathi Sastri in regard to Pancharagam work in the temple of Sri Seshachalapathiswami at Nanjangud —

b) Dumb Counsel's office records on the subject and also those of the office of the M.C. on the subject are not available.

7) Ref. Calling for the same is dated 20/5 for docs —

G.S. No. 20/5

8) Dr. 21/5

No 1559 dy 27.5.1935 from the Madras Commissioner — Calling for additional records on the subject.

Letter No H.C. 91/34-35 dy 12.7.35 from the Madras Commissioner forwarding additional records —

"The petitioner Raghupathi Sastri is a Archaka and the report of the Archaka dated 20/5/31 to have acted as the Pancharagam of the Nanjangud temple from 28/5/30 to 2/2/1931 — & is reported to have worked in that capacity satisfactorily. The same Archaka on 12.11.30 has reported that Raghupathi Sastri is unfit to be Pancharagam as he has no grip over the temple subordinates & Cooks therefore cannot manage the affairs

3

4

5

Dr. 28/5 28/5

22 MAY 1935 GENL & REV. SEC

efficiently & in time - He is one Ranganayaki
Jois who was a temple servant
Jois who was formerly employed in the was
appointed as Pancharathegar Tamil for 3 months & a report was called for
by the S.D.O as to how he has worked during
the period. As the time allowed was not
found sufficient to test the ability of
the aq. Pancharathegar, he was kept
on for an equal period. On 18.1.32
the amildar has reported that Ranganayaki
Jois is somehow managing the work of the
Pancharathegar & that he may be kept on
till the end of June 1932 as a temporary Pancharathegar,
with a view to test his efficiency. The
pay proposed in this case being Rs 12/-
as against Rs 20/- allowed to the permanent
incumbent (one Srikantaiya). The S.D.O
on 24/1/32 observed thereupon that instead
of reducing the pay of the post on account
of inferior men, it is better to get qualified
men on a higher pay. The Amildar while
the above says & submitted that he would make
further
report when better qualified men are
available & that as in the meanwhile
the present temporary Pancharathegar
might be allowed Rs 15/- p.m.
This was sanctioned by the S.D.O
on 30/5/32 - Raghupathi Sastri
the present pair (before & one)

NOTE—Contn. Sheet. 4.

pertaining to authorities in the matter of the Pampathegars
with Lelo Legislation - on 10.11.33 the S.D.O. Dt.
called for a detailed report - It was reported that
the book of a Pampathegar is a onerous
one one who is not capable can hardly
do justice to the Office, that in his opinion
Raghupathi Sastri is too old & unable
to discharge the duties of the Office efficiently - V
& that the present ag arrangement maybe
made permanent.

(5) [The Temple Peshkar's
report of 27.11.33 shows that the
present petr was then aged 49, while
the then ag Pampathegar Ramaswami Ayr
was of the age of 46.]. The S.D.O returned
the records with the observation that
the petr was too old & unable
to discharge the duties of a Pampathegar
& directed that the ag man may continue
as such. Thereupon the present
petr appealed to the D.C. Mysore.
with the result that the petr was rejected T
on the ground of his having been
too old unable & to do the duties Sahajashrik
Then he appealed to the Govt. who in
rejecting the appeal petn has observed
that the D.C's order Calls for no interference. R
It is against this order an appeal now
lies before Govt. Apart from his age question,

Irrespective of the appeal terms
Bar Gen

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 302 of 1934

App. F. III—2]

Serial No.

the petr's request is rejected as he is considered by the local authorities unfit to be Panchayatdar as he has no grip over the subordinates & can't manage the affairs efficiently and in time

ii) Subs for orders if the petr may be heard and the case posted for hearing.

G.S 1/8/35

iii) In this case the S. Dn. the D.C. & the M.C. have all taken the same view that the petr is too old and unable to discharge the duties of a Panchayatdar. The petr. no doubt says in his petition that he is as strong as the Asst. Panchayatdar & that he may be subjected to medical Exam. If it is for the Superior Officers to say whether he is fit or not. Since the Amildar has reported that he is unfit & the S. Dn. has agreed with that view and the D.C. & the M.C. have also accepted the view & rejected the appeal, it is for orders whether the case may be posted for hearing or the appeal rejected.

829

May I know to be rejected

Ti Member attending IT.11

JPS

PA to Hon 7/8

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL. NOTE Covering Sheet
16 AUG 1935
NO 1223

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—34.5

3 appl 20 of 1

C/143 File No. 202 of 1934 G Secre

Dft. Subs for orders

G.J 8.8.35
19.8.35

June 8/1935

No 276 of 26.8.1935 to the petitioner intimating that his appeal [illegible] —

No 277 of 26.8.1935 to the Magistrate concerned forwarding copy of the above & returning records received from him with the subject

20 AUG. 1935
GENL & REV. SECTT.

B
14.9.35





Government of Mysore,

Muz appl 20 of 19

GEN 2884 Bangalore

22 JAN 1935

MUZRAI BRANCH

FINANCE

No.....

Muz 302-34

Muzrai

2

18/1/35

Sir,

I beg to prefer the following appeal against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore approving the appointment of one Ranga Swamy Jois to the post of Parupathegar of the Sri Srikanteswara Swami Temple at Nanjangud, on the following grounds:-

1) " I have put in longer total service than Rangaswamy Jois in the temple."

2) Rangaswamy Jois and myself are almost of the same age, but I may admit that he may be younger by about two or three years than myself. I am hale and healthy and quite fit for any work involving even physical labour. My age is about 50 years which is below the of superannuation of Government officials. The opinion of the Amuldar Nanjangud taluk which runs thus " నిమగి కాయల వృద్ధాప్యము వలు మత్తు నీవు చాలించెదవలసిన వస్తు నివరణలు అత్యధికములు "

is based on facts and I must respectfully submit his opinion that cannot be substantiated. I am as strong as or even stronger than Rangaswamy Jois. This can be ascertained by an expert Medical Examination. This opinion being the basis for the entire case should, I pray be zealously scrutinized by the Government of His Highness the Maharaja.

P.T.O.

3) I was holding the post of " ADDIK
and I am holding it even as [illegible] Raaga-
[illegible] Jois was only a " Paricharaka " of the
Sri Ammanavara Gudi Temple. Addika is the
[illegible] officiel to Parupathegar, as his
[illegible] are the supervision and control over
all the servants of the temple. I have dis-
charge the duties of this office without
giving any rumour for complaint throughout
my service. By virtue of this office I claim
[illegible] profe[illegible]l claim [illegible] Parupathe-
[illegible] [illegible] my person. Paricharka
is only a person to assist an Archak and for
[illegible] he cannot lay claim for a post of
[illegible] of supervision.

[illegible] I [illegible] account [illegible]
[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] increase of
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] Srikanteshwara who is found fil
[illegible] work [illegible] [illegible], I acted for
nearly eight months and I have discharged my
duties without being found fault with. In-
[illegible] of [illegible] this post has been snatched away
from me. I beg to submit that this is the
[illegible] of injustice done to me.

For the foregoing reasons I most humbly
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] may be enquired
into and justice done to me by revising the orders
[illegible] [illegible] Commissioner in my favour.

I beg to remain, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

11-10-35

Forwarded with compliments to the Hon'ble Finance Commissioner for favour of report with connected records by mail

Bangalore
30.10.35

1098/Mus & S-2-35

OFFICE OF THE HON'BLE FINANCE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE
6 FEB 1935

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

No. Apl 9 34 35 — *Dated Bangalore,* 5 - 11 - 193 4 (7)

Endorsement *granted to* Raghunathisastri, Adda, Sri Srikanteswara-swamy temple, Nanjangud.

Petition Register No. App.9/34-35

Dated 26-10-34

Subject :—

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, approving the appointment of one Rangaswami Jois to the post of parpathegar in the Nanjangud temple in preference to the appellant.

in reply to his Petition Register No. as per margin.

The Petitioner is informed that his appeal is rejected as the Deputy Commissioner's order calls for no interference.

For *Muzrai Commissioner.*

WD 01614– GPB—250—3- -34

No. M.C. 21/34-35
Encl / file

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 10. April 1935

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
1043
13 APR 1935

To

Mes 30 2-34-3

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

mes

V/11/4

SIR,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 24th May *1935*

No. 1559
Mis 302-34-4

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

Subject:- Appeal petition of one Nagupathi Sastri claiming the Parupathegar's post in the temple of Sri Srikanteswara Swami at Nanjangud.

- - -

With reference to your letter No.M.C.91/34-35 dated 10th April 1935 submitting records on the above subject, I am directed to state that your office file on the subject and that of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore are not found among the papers received with your letter under advertence and to request you to be so good as to arrange for the forwardal of the same for reference.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Chief Secretary to Government.

bnl.2

T .....

.....

.....

Section M/3

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. 1559

To

The M C

Subject:- Absence pen of one Rajampathi Sastri claiming the Pampathegaris profits in the Temple of Sri Somaleswara Swamy at Vaijangad.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. dt 91/34-35 of 10.4.35 calling for records on the above subject, I am directed to state that the your office file

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue . 27-5-35

Signed by Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures ... .

Copied by ....

Examined by ....

WD 0677—G P B—15,000—9-11-33

of the D.C. Mysore are not found
among the papers received with your
letter under reference and
if necessary will be regarded as
an application for the same for review.

In this connection I am
to add that I would be glad if
in future particulars
[illegible] records are submitted more
especially in respect of
appeals preferred before Govt
against your
orders.

Name Etc
21/6
Forest Ce

Ewel 34-35 47 file

Govt. G. S.

302-345

OFFICE OF H MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,... ...10th July 1935

12

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAU, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

GENL & REV SECRETARIAT 48 15 JUL 1935

TO

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., P.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....General..... *Department*

GENERAL 12 JULY 35 1317

SIR,

Appeal of one Raghupathi Sastri re: his claim to the Parupathegar's place in the Sri Srikanteswaraswami Temple at Nanjangud.

As desired in your letter No.1559 dated the 27th May 1935, I have the honor to forward herewith this office file as also that of the Deputy Commissioner's Office, Mysore, on the above subject.

only a D.O. sheet was received - no further records -

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Please quote this number in your future communications.
No. 296

Office of the Govt Rep. Secy. Kandy

Dated Bangalore 19/8/1935

Mag 302-34-b

2 file

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Mr. Raghupathi Sastri Grandson of Ganapathi Sastri, Sri Srikanteswara Swami Temple, Nanjanged

Reference:—His/~~Her letter~~ appeal/petition dated 17.1.35

Subject:—

Appeal against order No A.Rol 9/36-3 of 7.11.34 of the M.C. regarding his claim to the work of pancharathna in Sri Srikanteswara Swami Temple - Nanjanged.

Reference is invited to item No 1 below. B.O

Signature. 20/8

Designation. for Govt Rep

---

*1. The request cannot be granted. His appeal spn is rejected

~~2. The letter/petition has been~~ referred ~~to~~ ... for.....

3. Attention is drawn to this office No..... dated .....

4. No..... dated..... .....cannot be traced; a copy may be sent.

5. The enclosures are not received.

6. The petition is returned herewith as
   (i) it is not in the prescribed form
   or (ii) it is not duly stamped
   or (iii) it is not presented within the prescribed time
   or (iv) it is not accompanied by a copy of the order appealed from or complained of.

7. The petition is returned for presentation to .....

8. The petition is returned
   (*a*) as it is written illegibly
   (*b*) as its subject matter is not clear
   (*c*) as it is couched in improper language.

27/8 2 files
file 26+31

* ~~Reasons if any to be mentioned in brief.~~

Copy to the M.C.
with request to be returned
with his letter no 4 c 3/36
B 10.4.35 B.O

WD 01724—GPB—8,000—23-4-28